

(ORDER LIST: 592 U. S.)

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2020

**ORDERS IN PENDING CASES**

20M28           MARCUS, GLENDA V. MARCUS, SYLVESTER  
20M29           WARREN, LAWANDA V. KENNECTION INSTALLATION, ET AL.  
20M30           SYKES, DERRY V. NY OFFICE OF CHILDREN, ET AL.  
20M31           STRINGER, ANTHONY A. V. LINCOLN COUNTY JAIL, ET AL.  
20M32           ROSE, RICHARD W. V. DEPT. OF JUSTICE

The motions to direct the Clerk to file petitions for writs of certiorari out of time are denied.

19-5807        EDWARDS, THEDRICK V. VANNOY, WARDEN

The motion of the Acting Solicitor General for leave to participate in oral argument as \_\_\_\_\_ and for divided argument is granted.

20-28           PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS, ET AL. V. LAURENT, TIMOTHY, ET AL.

The Acting Solicitor General is invited to file a brief in this case expressing the views of the United States.

20-5532        GOLDEN, LARRY V. UNITED STATES

20-5539        RUMZIS, GINGER G. V. SAUL, ANDREW M.

The motions of petitioners for leave to proceed \_\_\_\_\_ are denied. Petitioners are allowed until November 9, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fees required by Rule 38(a).

**CERTIORARI GRANTED**

19-1212        WOLF, SEC. OF HOMELAND, ET AL. V. INNOVATION LAW LAB, ET AL.

20-18           LANGE, ARTHUR G. V. CALIFORNIA





20-5449 DAWSON, CAROLYN R. V. PAKENHAM, KEVIN  
20-5456 ROBERTSON, LORENZO V. PACE, OZELL, ET AL.  
20-5460 CALVIN, KEITH L. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.  
20-5463 ROGERS, ROWMOTO V. SKIPPER, WARDEN  
20-5491 M. C. V. INDIANA  
20-5494 SNOW, ERNEST R. V. INDIANA  
20-5503 MARTIN, KEVIN L. V. NICHOLSON, CHRISTOPHER  
20-5504 MARTIN, KEVIN L. V. CAPRON, CATHLEEN, ET AL.  
20-5506 LOPEZ, RODOLFO V. INDIANA  
20-5514 NELSON, DARYL D. V. BROWN, ACTING WARDEN  
20-5525 BAILEY, LARRY R. V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.  
20-5528 ROMERO, MIGUEL V. CALIFORNIA  
20-5536 MCKINNEY, JOSEPH S. V. LOUISIANA  
20-5544 JACKSON, CLARENCE B. V. SAUL, ANDREW M.  
20-5546 CARRYL, RUDOLPH V. UNITED STATES  
20-5585 NIKOLLA, DENIS V. UNITED STATES  
20-5613 SMITH, KEITH B. V. NAGY, WARDEN  
20-5630 THACKER, MARK A. V. INDIANA  
20-5647 MOYNIHAN, ROBERT W. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.  
20-5676 VENEGAS, LEON V. REWERTS, WARDEN  
20-5690 LOFF, DARRICK M. V. BRNOVICH, ATT'Y GEN. OF AZ  
20-5707 REEVES, RUTH E. V. ESPER, SEC. OF DEFENSE, ET AL.  
20-5714 KOSHMI DER, DONALD J. V. LESATZ, WARDEN  
20-5719 CRUZ, EFRAIN C. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.  
20-5730 BUTLER, JIMMIE V. UNITED STATES  
20-5738 WASHINGTON, WILLIE H. V. UNITED STATES  
20-5739 ROTHENBERG, DAVID V. UNITED STATES  
20-5740 MAHAN, EDWARD V. UNITED STATES

20-5741 SANCHEZ-HERNANDEZ, JUAN G. V. UNITED STATES

20-5751 FERNANDEZ-DE CAMPA, PEDRO V. UNITED STATES

20-5752

20-5565 WEIDRICK, MARY JO V. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S.

The petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment is denied.

20-5659 ROBLES, GABRIEL M. V. WILKIE, SEC. OF VA

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

20-5755 JONES, JOSEPH L. V. GOOGLE LLC, INC.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. Justice Gorsuch took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

**HABEAS CORPUS DENIED**

20-5837 IN RE EDWARD D. OBERWISE

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

**MANDAMUS DENIED**

20-5365 IN RE JACQUELYN B. N' JAI

20-5367 IN RE ABDUL MOHAMMED

The petitions for writs of mandamus are denied.

20-5406 IN RE ABDUL MOHAMMED

The petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition is denied.

**REHEARINGS DENIED**

19-8232 JACKSON, WILLIAM L. V. MISSISSIPPI

19-8279 LaGASSE, JEFFREY V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC

19-8280 JIMENEZ, JESUS J. V. DAVIS, DIR., TX DCJ

19-8348 KEHANO, ROLAND I. V. HARRINGTON, WARDEN, ET AL.

19-8357 LOUT, JEFFERY J. V. MONTANA

The petitions for rehearing are denied.

Cite as: 592 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2020)

1

Statement of GORSUCH, J.

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

CLYDE S. BOVAT VERMONT

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME  
COURT OF VERMONT

Statement of GORSUCH, J.

home, they usually need one of those things to reach the home's front door in the first place. After surveying the Fourth Amendment's original meaning and history, [redacted] acknowledged that a doorbell or knocker on the front door often signals a homeowner's consent allowing visitors to "approach the home by the front path, knock promptly, wait briefly to be received, and then (absent invitation to linger longer) leave." [redacted] at 8. The Court recognized, too, that law enforcement agents, like everyone else, may take up this "implied license" to approach. But, the Court stressed, officers may not abuse the limited scope of this license by snooping around the premises on their way to the front door. Whether done by a private person or a law enforcement agent, that kind of conduct is an unlawful trespass—and, when conducted by the government, it amounts to an unreasonable search in violation of the Fourth Amendment. On this much, the Court unanimously agreed. See [redacted] at 19 (ALITO, J., dissenting) ("A visitor cannot traipse through the garden, meander into the backyard, or take other circuitous detours that veer from the pathway that a visitor would customarily use"); [redacted] at 20 ("The license is limited to the amount of time it would customarily take to approach the door, pause long enough to see if someone is home, and (if not expressly invited to stay longer) leave").

It's hard to see how the case before us could have been decided without reference to [redacted]. Suspecting Clyde Bovat of unlawfully hunting a deer at night (Vermont calls it a "deer jacking"), game wardens decided to pay him a visit to—in their words—"investigate further." But the wardens admit that "pretty soon after arriving" they focused on a window in Mr. Bovat's detached garage. Heading there and peering inside, the wardens spotted what they thought could be deer hair on the tailgate of a parked truck.







## Statement of GORSUCH, J.

courts. For another, there might be reason to hope that, while Vermont missed \_\_\_\_\_ in one deer-jacking case, its oversight will prove a stray mistake. But however all that may be, the error here remains worth highlighting to ensure it does not recur. Under \_\_\_\_\_, there exist no “semi-private areas” within the curtilage where governmental agents may roam from edge to edge. Nor does \_\_\_\_\_ afford officers a fifteen-minute grace period to run around collecting as much evidence as possible before the clock runs out or the homeowner intervenes. The Constitution’s historic protections for the sanctity of the home and its surroundings demand more respect from us all than was displayed here.

Cite as: 592 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2020)

1

THOMAS, J., dissenting

**SUPREMR 091c SUPREMR 002P THE UNITED STATES 2111 0111**

